

**Draft Agenda
Hunters Point Shipyard
Property Transfer Conference Call
Regulatory Agencies, Navy, City and Fivepoint**

**Thursday, September 24, 2020
9:30 to 10:30 am**

Conference Call Number sent on calendar invite

1) Introductions

EPA – John, Wayne, Brianna

DTSC –

City – Amy, Christina, Kasheica,

Lennar/Five-Point – Andrea, Chris, Gordon

Navy – Thomas, Derek, Heather, Paul, Brooks (non-rad), Marvin

2) Agenda Review

- 3) Dates for:** next conference call October 22, next, next propose December 3 (after the BCT meeting; so in the afternoon)

4) Parcel G field work & related and 5YR including Tech Memos

a. RSY Pads to be used across the base –

- i. The Navy is already laying out soil at 9 inches and multiple layers via a field change request form. Navy will send some responses to EPA.
- ii. Wayne: This change increases the detection limits, and we are looking into whether these changes is significant. We are focused on radium, thorium, and cesium and the increase leaves the MDC less than the RG for radium and thorium (good news). The MDC for cesium is further increased above the RG.
- iii. EPA has concerns this action is inconsistent with the Work Plan (3 out of 4 citations in the WP speak to 6 inches). We need to be on the same page. The Navy has used 9 inches in the past at HP and at other projects. Statements in the work plan that describe a “maximum depth” to 6 inches plus the MDCs are all presented assuming 6 inches. This is a loss of sensitivity.
 1. We have concerns how this change will be seen by the public, once they are aware.
 2. Concern about how the public will be informed by this change.
 3. We need to be clear on what 6 or 9 achieves for the site.
 4. Navy asked how to be clear to the public. Marvin said that we want to be able to explain how RSY pads were used appropriately to scan/screen materials in a manner that was reasonable. Yolanda said we should have a way to daylight this and document it. Thomas said the way to document this is through subsequent reports. Yolanda reminded everyone this isn’t a “normal situation” and we need to be clear on any changes. John suggested there could be a place on the website to document “field status” updates. The Navy will come up with ideas

for whatever communication might be necessary after the technical details are worked out.

- b. **Radiological RGs for buildings –**
 - i. John mentioned EPA commented on the Navy's RESRAD building calculations
 - ii. Navy has been talking internally about EPA's letter. The Navy is trying to get some answers from their technical RESRAD folks. EPA understand the complexity of the questions raised, which was reflected in how long it took for EPA to respond.
- c. **Memo-to-the-file –** Marvin suggests we are close to being done; and he is coordinating with his clients
 - i. Navy feels he will be able to get something out to the agencies "very soon." They are trying to incorporate all the comments in a consistent way. Navy is changing the structure of the document to be more straightforward. Yolanda appreciated the need to restructure the document but wonders if the site attorneys need to review prior to sending to site attorneys. Brianna agreed she would like to review before a draft final version goes to management.
 - ii. John suggested the Navy start thinking about how it will make this document available for the public.
- d. **Other radiological retesting –** Draft final on UCs/D-2 is due to agencies on Oct 5, to be finalized in November, then would need to make fieldwork decisions on when to mobilize. The Navy feels the fieldwork can overlap. The Navy confirmed the dust management and air monitoring plan will be consistent with Parcel G across future work plans. There was a discussion on fieldwork schedule. There is not enough room for all the soil to be spread on the RSY pads; so, they will need to be stacked.

5) Updates on communications and meetings

- a. **SFDPH has a new public records request from Michael Boyd of CARE –** all PM data from June 1, 2020.
- b. **Abbey vs US Navy lawsuit –** SFPD complaint; Marvin will be sending over a copy of the complaint
- c. **OCII received a request from a reference librarian for the conveyance agreement between the Navy and former development agency.** Gordon said this wasn't online on the Navy's or City's website (he was wondering if it was publicly available). He suggested the document could be added to OCII "project document" library.
- d. **Navy got a new FOIA from Dr. Sumchai about landfill gas monitoring data.** Yesterday, the Navy released the response.
- e. **The CAC did receive a "notice of a whistleblower" by Dr. Sumchai against the HPS CAC about her request to present her urine screening study at a CAC meeting.** HPS CAC is concerned about Dr. Sumchai presenting at an upcoming meeting without someone from the agencies also presenting.
 - i. The Navy discussed this internally and will polish/refresh some old fact sheets and bring them forward to help with an educational aspect. Should the Navy consider a separate section on its website (educational series) or email campaign?
 - ii. The Navy wants to be clear that they are not stepping out of their lane.
 - iii. EPA reminded the Navy of its role as a facilitator of the discussion.

- iv. EPA also opened the offer to help with the development of messaging, etc.
- f. HPS CAC meeting next Monday
- g. Supervisor Walton requested a meeting between EPA/Navy to discuss community involvement

6) Miscellaneous Items

7) Action Items